Law and Human Behavior, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1978

Notes/Discussions

Salient Factor Score and Releasee Behavior: Three Validation Samples*

Peter B. Hoffman,† Barbara Stone-Meierhoefer,† and James L. Beck‡

This paper provides an opportunity to observe the application of an actuarial device, used by the United States Parole Commission as an aid in parole selection, to three separate validation samples—each exceeding 1000 cases. Follow-up data for this study were provided through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, evidence is presented which may shed light on the conflict in the literature regarding whether or not the rate of unfavorable outcome of released prisoners at risk actually declines substantially after the first year (i.e., whether or not the first year after release is really the "most" critical).

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to structure its broad discretion and provide greater consistency in parole release decision making, the United States Parole Commission (formerly the U.S. Board of Parole) has adopted and implemented explicit decision-making guidelines.[1] Decisions outside the guidelines—either above or below—are authorized, but only for "good cause" and upon the provision of specific written reasons.[2] Thus the guideline system is designed to enhance rationality and equity in decision-making without removing the opportunity for individual case consideration. Appendix 1 displays the

*Adapted from Report Fifteen, United States Parole Commission Research Unit, August 1977.

†United States Parole Commission, Washington, D.C.

‡United States Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C.

[1]28 C.F.R. §2.52, 38 *Federal Register* 222 (November 19, 1973), as amended. [Most recently published as 28 C.F.R. §2.20, 42 *Federal Register* 190 (September 30, 1977) pp. 52398–52399]; see also D. M. Gottfredson. P. B. Hoffman, M. H. Sigler, and L. T. Wilkins, "Making paroling policy explicit," *21 Crime and Delinquency* 1 (1975); P. B. Hoffman, "Federal parole guidelines: Three years of experience," United States Board of Parole Research Unit, Report Ten (1975).

[2]28 C.F.R. §2.20 (c), supra note 1. See also 18 U.S.C. 4206, as revised (1976).

0147-7307/78/0300-0047$05.00/0© 1978 Plenum Publishing Corporation

guidelines currently in use for adult cases.[3] First begun as part of a pilot project in October 1972, guideline usage was expanded to all federal parole release decisions during the summer of 1974. In 1976, a major legislative revision of the federal parole statute (the Parole Commission and Reorganization Act) specifically incorporated a mandate for the use of the guideline model.[4]

On one axis of the two-dimensional guideline matrix, the seriousness of the prisoner's present offense behavior is rated. Parole prognosis, defined as the likelihood of new criminal conduct or parole violation, is the focus of the second axis. An actuarial device termed a "salient factor score," the subject of this paper, is used by the Commission as an aid in making parole prognosis assessments. Decision-makers retain the authority to override the actuarial device in a particular case by making a decision outside the guidelines. As noted, however, specific written reasons for any such override must be given.[5] Table 1 shows the salient factor score used by the Commission between October 1973 and March 1977.[6]

Initial construction and validation of the salient factor score, based on samples of federal prisoners released in 1970 (combined $N = 2483$), were reported by Hoffman and Beck.[7] A subsequent validation using a 1972 release sample ($N = 1011$) has also been reported.[8] Both of these studies utilized a 2-year follow-up period for each individual, calculated from month of release. This paper presents findings from an additional validation sample of 1971 federal releasees, for which both a 2- and a 3-year follow-up period are available. This longer follow-up period also enables analysis of the association between time elapsed after release and likelihood of unfavorable outcome.

SAMPLE SELECTION

From the population of all federal prisoners serving maximum sentences of more than 1 year and 1 day who were released to the community during the last 6 months of 1971, a 30% sample was drawn. This resulted in an N of 1138 cases.[9] As with the studies cited above,[10] all three primary forms of release (parole/mandatory

[3]Separate guidelines are used for (Youth)/(Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act) cases. See 28 C.F.R. §2.20, as revised, supra note 1.

[4]Public Law 94-233, effective 5/14/76; see especially 18 U.S.C. 4206 as revised (1976) and the Conference Committee report pertaining to this section [2 U.S.C. Cog. and Admin. News (1976), pp. 335–370].

[5]C.F.R. §2.20 (e), supra note 1.

[6]In April 1977, the salient factor score was replaced by a slightly modified version. See 28 C.F.R. §2.20, 42 Federal Register 41 (March 2, 1977), p. 12045. This revised device is shown in Appendix II. Appendices III–V present the analyses discussed in this paper as applied to the revised device.

[7]P. B. Hoffman and J. L. Beck, "Parole decision-making: A salient factor score," 2 *Journal of Criminal Justice* 3 (1974), pp. 195–206.

[8]P. B. Hoffman and J. L. Beck, "Salient factor score validation — A 1972 release cohort," 4 *Journal of Criminal Justice* 1 (1976), pp. 69–76.

[9]Subjects released to detainer or deportation warrants were excluded, as were escapees or those released by court order. There were 25 eligible cases whose FBI records could not be located; these also were excluded.

[10]Supra, notes 7 and 8.

Table 1. Salient Factor Score

Case name _____ Register No. _____

Item A ..... ☐
No prior convictions (adult or juvenile) = 2
One or two prior convictions = 1
Three or more prior convictions = 0

Item B ..... ☐
No prior incarcerations (adult or juvenile) = 2
One or two prior incarcerations = 1
Three or more prior incarcerations = 0

Item C ..... ☐
Age at first commitment (adult or juvenile) 18 years or older = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item D ..... ☐
Commitment offense did not involve auto theft = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item E ..... ☐
Never had parole revoked or been committed for a new offense while on parole = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item F ..... ☐
No history of heroin or opiate dependence = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item G ..... ☐
Has completed 12th grade or received GED = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item H ..... ☐
Verified employment (or full-time school attendance) for a total of at least 6 months during the last 2 years in the community = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item I ..... ☐
Release plan to live with spouse and/or children = 1
Otherwise = 0

Total score ..... ☐

release/expiration of sentence) were included. The sample was selected by including all cases whose prison register (identification) numbers ended in selected digits (i.e., for each digit selected, a 10% sample is provided). As prison identification numbers are assigned sequentially on admission, this procedure is assumed to provide a reasonable approximation of random selection.

DATA COLLECTION

For each sample case, a set of over 60 items of background data (including those items which compose the salient factor score) had been coded from the prison/parole file by research staff. Specific information on items coded, data collection procedures, and coding reliability is provided in a series of reports prepared by the Parole

Decision-Making project, an L.E.A.A.-funded study of federal parole decision-making.[11]

Follow-up, using a 3-year period calculated for each case from month of release,[12] was obtained through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A deck of computer cards containing FBI number, name, and date of birth for each sample case was run through the FBI's Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system. For each case on which a match occurred, a computerized record of arrest ("rap sheet") was provided. Those sample cases not matched by this method were forwarded to the FBI's Identification Division for manual pulling and provision of "rap sheet" copies.[13]

Although FBI rap sheet records are known to be incomplete (i.e., not all jurisdictions consistently provide all arrest data), they are nevertheless the best source of information for follow-up of federal offenders who (1) may be released to any of the 50 states, (2) may or may not have a period of postrelease supervision, or (3) may have postrelease supervision of varying length. Reliance on FBI records enables use of a consistent follow-up period for each individual, whether or not postrelease supervision is available.

Another problem encountered in using FBI rap sheets as a data source is that for a substantial number of arrest entries there is no disposition recorded. Thus, as with the two earlier follow-up studies cited, for each sample case in which a missing disposition could affect one of the criterion measures selected a letter was sent to the arresting agency and/or court requesting dispositional information.[14]

CRITERION MEASURES

Three criterion measures of favorable/unfavorable outcome defined for purposes of this study are shown in Table 2. Using criterion measure X, for example, a case is scored as having a favorable outcome unless one or more of the following occurs during the follow-up period: (1) an arrest which results in a commitment of 60 days or more, (2) a return to prison as a parole violator, (3) an outstanding absconder

[11]Grant NI-72-0716. D. M. Gottfredson, L. T. Wilkins, P. B. Hoffman, and S. M. Singer, "The utilization of experience in parole decision-making: Summary report," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2700-00277 (1974); S. M. Singer and D. M. Gottfredson, "Development of a data base for parole decision making: Report number one," Parole Decision-Making Project, National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, Davis, Calif. (1973); D. M. Gottfredson and S. M. Singer, Parole decision-making coding manual: Report number two," Parole Decision Making Project, National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, Davis, Calif. (1973); J. L. Beck and S. M. Singer, "The reliability of information in the parole decision-making study: Report number twelve," Parole Decision-Making Project, National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center (1973).

[12]For example, a prisoner released in September 1971 would be followed through September 1974.

[13]The Computerized Criminal History system (CCH) was implemented by the FBI in 1971. As the Bureau of Prisons had not yet completed adding all federal inmates to CCH during this first year of its operation, the records for some of our subjects were not in the system. This necessitated using both the computerized and manual methods for obtaining follow-up.

[14]There were 168 individuals for whom dispositional information was needed. The first follow-up letter was sent out in September 1975. If the dispositional information was not obtained by July 15, 1976, the case was counted as having favorable outcome on the "conviction" or "commitment" criterion measures. There were 47 such pending cases counted as "favorable outcome," constituting 4.1% of the total sample.

Table 2. Criterion Measures[a]

Criterion measure X (no new commitment): Favorable outcome = no new commitment of 60 days or more; no return to prison as a parole violator; no outstanding absconder warrant; and not deceased while committing a criminal act.

Criterion measure Y (no new conviction): Favorable outcome = no new conviction; no return to prison as a parole violator; no outstanding absconder warrant; and not deceased while committing a criminal act.

Criterion measure Z (no new arrest): Favorable outcome = no new arrest; no return to prison as a parole violator; no outstanding absconder warrant; and not deceased while commiting a criminal act.

[a]Arrests for certain petty offenses (such as drunkenness, gambling, and vagrancy) are not entered into the FBI's CCH system and, for consistency, were not counted if recorded on the manually located rap sheet copies. Dispositions (i.e., convictions or commitments) resulting from such arrest(s) were also not counted. If an arrest occurred within the follow-up period, coding staff was directed to go beyond the follow-up period to record dispositional information (i.e., conviction or commitment).

warrant, or (4) death while committing a criminal act.[15] Criterion measure X is the most liberal of the three definitions of favorable outcome. Criterion measure Z is the most stringent in that it counts a recorded new arrest — regardless of disposition—as indicating unfavorable outcome.

Each choice of criterion measure has advantages and disadvantages. For example, it can be argued that criterion measure Z (new arrest) more closely captures the underlying dimension of criminal behavior than criterion measure Y (new conviction) or X (new commitment) as the latter are more subject to the vagaries of the judicial process. On the other hand, it can be contended that persons with prior criminal records are prone to be arrested merely "on suspicion" and thus a more reliable measure of criminal behavior is a judicial finding of guilt (criterion measure Y) or of criminal conduct sufficiently serious to warrant commitment (criterion measure X). As will be seen below, agreement among the three criterion measures chosen is quite high. Consequently, in assessing the predictive power of the salient factor score the choice of criterion measure appears to make little difference.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 displays percent favorable outcome by salient factor score (using a 3-year follow-up period) for each of the three criterion measures selected. As can be readily

[15]The number of those classified with "unfavorable outcome" as a result of "death during commission of a criminal act" is quite small (4 out of the sample of 1138 or 0.3%). Also, it should be pointed out that none of the criterion measures entirely removes the problem concerning the classification of persons returned to prison for technical parole violations (violations not resulting from conviction for a new offense). Since only persons released to parole/mandatory release supervision are liable for return for technical violations, the classification of such cases as having unfavorable outcome means that those persons released under supervision are subject to greater risk of being included in the unfavorable outcome category than those released without supervision. On the other hand, if technical violators were classified as having favorable outcome, parolees would be subject to less risk of being classified as having unfavorable outcome than unsupervised releasees. In the opinion of the researchers, the first alternative appeared as the most desirable for the purpose at hand.

Table 3. Percent Favorable Outcome by Salient Factor Score—1971 Releasees (3-Year Follow-up)

Salient factor score	Criterion measure X (no new "commitment")	Criterion measure Y (no new "conviction")	Criterion measure Z (no new "arrest")	*N*
Very good (11–9)	94.9	92.7	83.1	178
11	92.0	92.0	84.0	25
10	95.5	94.0	86.6	67
9	95.3	91.9	80.2	86
Good (8–6)	75.3	70.3	61.9	344
8	80.0	78.8	70.6	85
7	74.6	69.3	63.2	114
6	73.1	66.2	55.9	145
Fair (5–4)	60.3	54.3	42.7	335
5	63.0	58.0	45.7	162
4	57.8	50.9	39.9	173
Poor (3–0)	49.8	39.9	28.8	281
3	55.3	44.0	32.6	141
2	44.1	36.0	26.1	111
1	42.9	32.1	21.4	28
0	—	—	—	1[a]
All scores	67.7	61.6	51.4	1,138
Mean cost rating (MCR)	.37	.41	.40	
Point-biserial correlation (*r*)	.32	.37	.38	

[a]This case was scored as having favorable outcome on criterion measures X and Y, and unfavorable outcome on criterion Z.

seen, the percentage of cases with favorable outcome decreases rather consistently as one moves from higher to lower salient factor scores, regardless of criterion measure used.[16] The point-biserial correlation coefficients (.32–.38) and the mean cost ratings (.37–.41) obtained for the different criterion measures are comparable to those of other prediction studies.[17] Thus this additional validation sample adds to the evidence of the ability of the salient factor score to distinguish among risk groups.

Table 4 presents percent favorable outcome (criterion measure X) by salient fac-

[16]The percentages of cases on which the criterion measures agreed as to outcome are as follows: Arrest-Commitment, 83.7; Arrest-Conviction, 89.8; Conviction-Commitment, 93.9.

[17]See, for example, D. M. Gottfredson and K. B. Ballard, "The validity of two parole prediction scales: An eight year follow-up study," Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Vacaville, Calif. (1965), pp. 44, 48–50; F. H. Simon, "Prediction methods in criminology," Home Office Research Unit Report Number 7, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1971), pp. 30–57.

Table 4. Percent Favorable Outcome by Salient Factor Score Group: Present and Previous Samples (Criterion Measure X)[a]

	Percent favorable outcome				
	2-year follow-up				3-year follow-up
Salient factor score	1970 (C)[b]	1970 (V)[c]	1971	1972	1971
9–11	93.0	91.2	96.1	95.4	94.9
	(115)	(227)	(178)	(153)	(178)
6–8	77.4	79.1	79.9	83.7	75.3
	(266)	(459)	(344)	(289)	(344)
4–5	60.8	68.4	65.4	68.4	60.3
	(268)	(471)	(335)	(297)	(335)
0–3	49.8	55.4	58.4	57.0	49.8
	(253)	(424)	(281)	(272)	(281)
All scores	66.7	71.3	72.8	73.8	67.7
	(902)	(1581)	(1138)	(1011)	(1138)
MCR	.36	.32	.36	.39	.37
Point-biserial correlation (r)	.32	.28	.30	.32	.32

[a]The first line across the table identifies the sample by year of release. The upper number in each cell is the percent favorable outcome; the lower number (in parentheses) is the N for the cell.
[b]Construction sample.
[c]Validation sample.

tor score (collapsed into four score groups) for the 1971 sample, as well as for the three previous samples, using a 2-year follow-up period for all cases.[18] Data from the 1971 sample using a 3-year follow-up period are also shown.

Inspection of the percentages of favorable outcome by salient factor score group across the samples indicates that the predictive power of the salient factor score has remained relatively stable. This observation is confirmed by comparisons of either the mean cost ratings (.36; .32; .36; .39) or point-biserial correlation coefficients (.32; .28; .30; .32).[19] Furthermore, it appears from the two sets of 1971 data that the power of the salient factor score does not decrease and, in fact, may increase very slightly as one moves from a 2- to a 3-year follow-up period.

[18]To obtain 2-year follow-up data, a case was counted as having unfavorable outcome only if such outcome resulted from behavior occurring within the first 2 years.
[19]The point-biserial correlation is computed using the actual score from 0 to 11. The mean cost rating is calculated from grouped data for the four salient factor score categories.

Table 5. Percent Unfavorable Outcome in Relation to Time at Risk by Salient Factor Score—1971 Sample[a]

Salient factor score	Percent unfavorable outcome of cases at risk (actual number of unfavorable outcomes)		
	First year	Second year	Third year
Total (all scores) (N = 1138)[b]			
Criterion measure (X)	18.2(207)	11.0(102)	7.1(59)
Criterion measure (Z)	32.4(367)	16.9(130)	8.2(52)
Very good risk (9–11) (N = 178)			
Criterion measure (X)	2.8(5)	1.2(2)	1.2(2)
Criterion measure (Z)	9.6(17)	5.0(8)	3.3(5)
Good risk (6–8) (N = 344)			
Criterion measure (X)	11.6(40)	9.5(29)	5.8(16)
Criterion measure (Z)	20.9(72)	14.7(40)	8.2(19)
Fair risk (4–5) (N = 335)			
Criterion measure (X)	24.5(82)	13.4(34)	7.8(17)
Criterion measure (Z)	41.7(139)	18.6(36)	9.5(15)
Poor risk (0–3) (N = 281)			
Criterion measure (X)	28.5(80)	18.4(37)	14.6(24)
Criterion measure (Z)	49.8(139)	32.9(46)	13.8(13)

[a]The number of cases at risk is the N for the group minus the number of unfavorable outcomes recorded during the preceding period(s). It is apparent that the "arrest" criterion measure (Z) diminishes cases at risk faster than the "commitment" criterion measure (X).
[b]There were four subjects with unfavorable outcome on criterion Z (two in the "poor risk" and two in the "fair risk" categories) for whom the date of arrest was unavailable. These cases were excluded from analysis in relation to this criterion measure.

TIME TO FAILURE

Use of a 3-year follow-up period also allows examination of the association between time elapsed after release and rate of unfavorable outcome. Table 5 displays these results. It is apparent that the rate of unfavorable outcome during a given period, for those cases *at risk,* decreases for both criterion measures as one moves from the first through the third year.[20] That is, for releasees who survive the first year without unfavorable outcome the likelihood of unfavorable outcome during the second year is somewhat decreased. Similarly, the rate of unfavorable outcome of cases *at risk* is lower during the third year than during the second year.

As Table 5 shows, the drop in percent unfavorable outcome over the 3 years appears more dramatic for criterion measure Z (32.4/16.9/8.2%) than for criterion measure X (18.2/11.0/7.1%). This may shed light on an interesting inconsistency in

[20]All unfavorable outcome rates are presented as a percentage of those at risk. For example, the rate of unfavorable outcome during the second year is the number of cases with unfavorable outcome during the second year divided by the number of cases at risk during the second year (i.e., those who survived the first year).

the criminal justice literature. A frequent statement in probation/parole texts has been that the early postrelease period is the most critical (i.e., that if a releasee can survive the first year without "difficulty," his chance of subsequent favorable outcome is substantially enhanced).[21] However, at least two empirical studies, both using large samples and long-term follow-up, have found the decrease in the rate of unfavorable outcome from year to year during the first several years to be relatively slight when measured in relation to those actually at risk.[22] While one speculation has been that those claiming a rapidly diminishing unfavorable outcome rate have simply failed to consider this rate as a function of individuals *at risk*,[23] our results indicate that the use of different criterion measures may itself account for much of this difference. That is, while the two research efforts noted have used criterion measures of new conviction or commitment,[24] those persons whose experiences have led them to conclude that there is a more substantial drop in rate of unfavorable outcome (of those *at risk*) over time may likely have been relying on a different measure (i.e., new arrest) as the appropriate criterion of unfavorable outcome.[25]

Nevertheless, it is clear that even if the first year after release is the most critical, this does not necessarily imply that completion of the first year without difficulty guarantees later favorable outcome. While the rate of unfavorable outcome of those at risk in this sample decreases during the second year, it is far from zero. In fact, for the poor risk cases (salient factor score = 0–3) there is a 32.4% "new arrest" and 18.4% "new commitment" rate during the second year. However, for the very good risk cases (salient factor score = 9–11) these percentages are 5.0% and 1.2%, respectively. Further study using a somewhat larger sample and a substantially longer follow-up period (6 years) is presently under way to determine whether the trends found here are consistent and, if so, whether knowledge of time at risk without difficulty (either alone

---

[21]See for example, M. Matlin, ed., *Reappraising Crime Treatment: 1953 Yearbook*, New York: National Probation and Parole Association (1954), p. 31; the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967), p. 68.

[22]H. Kitchener, A. K. Schmidt, and D. Glaser, "How persistent is post-prison success?" 41 *Federal Probation* 1 (1977), pp. 9–15; D. M. Gottfredson and K. B. Ballard, supra note 17, pp. 29–39.

[23]D. M. Gottfredson and K. B. Ballard, supra note 17, pp. 29–39, 72; J. E. Berecochea, A. N. Himelson, and D. E. Miller, "The risk of failure during the early parole period: A methodological note," 63 *Journal of Criminal Law; Criminology and Police Science* 1 (1972), pp. 93–97.

[24]It is not clear from the empirical studies cited as to whether the time to "commitment" or "conviction" is taken from the date of arrest leading to the outcome or from the date of the outcome itself. If the date of outcome is used, the varying lengths of time it takes to process individuals through the courts may artificially obscure any actual decrease in rate of unfavorable outcome over time. In the present study, the date used for a new commitment (criterion measure X) or new conviction (criterion measure Y) is the date of arrest leading to the conviction or commitment.

[25]It is to be noted that 67% (395/550) of the cases which sustained unfavorable outcome on criterion measure Z (new arrest) during the follow-up period were—by the end of the follow-up period—also classified as having unfavorable outcome on criterion measure X (new commitment), although not necessarily as a result of the first arrest. For those whose first arrest resulted in a dismissal or lesser sanction, 48% (167/349) nevertheless eventually sustained an unfavorable outcome on the commitment criterion (measure X). If the first arrest occurred within 1 year after release, these percentages are 74% (271/367) and 58% (135/231), respectively.

or combined with salient factor score) can provide assistance in the making of determinations relative to reduction or termination of supervision.[26]

SUMMARY

Efforts in parole (or probation) prediction research have frequently suffered from serious methodological weaknesses. Especially prevalent has been the failure to adequately validate the devices developed. Other weaknesses have included the failure to apply a consistent follow-up (exposure) period to all cases in the sample and/or to ensure that the sample chosen adequately represented the population of releasees under study.[27]

The research presented in this paper provides an opportunity to observe the application of an actuarial device to three separate validation samples of prison releasees, each exceeding 1000 cases. Through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a 2-year follow-up period for each case in two of the validation samples and a 3-year follow-up period for each case in the third validation sample were made possible. The results obtained indicate that the salient factor score developed for the Parole Commission displays considerable stability over the period studied in its ability to assign cases to distinct "risk" groups (in relation to each of the three criterion measures chosen). Furthermore, while the choice of criterion measure does not appear to make much difference in assessing the predictive power of the device, there seems to be some evidence that this choice may help explain the conflict in the literature as to whether or not those who survive the first year or two after release are substantially less likely to sustain unfavorable outcome during a subsequent period.

[26]The revised federal legislation, supra note 4, contains a provision whereby the Commission may terminate parole supervision prior to the full expiration date of the sentence. After 5 years of supervision, the Commission must discharge from parole unless there is a finding that the parolee still presents a risk to society [18 U.S.C. 4211 (revised 1976)].

[27]For example, some studies have been able only to obtain follow-up information for either the period of parole supervision or a given number of months, whichever was shorter. Others have included only those cases paroled, which by their very nature are likely to constitute a nonrepresentative fraction of those released.

APPENDIX 1: Adult Guidelines for Decision-Making [Guidelines for Decision-Making, Customary Total Time to Be Served Before Release (Including Jail Time) (Effective 11/1/77)][a]

Offense characteristics: severity of offense behavior (examples)	Offender characteristics: parole prognosis (salient factor score)			
	Very good (11–9)	Good (8–6)	Fair (5–4)	Poor (3–0)
Low				
Escape [open institution or program (e.g., CTC, work release) — absent less than 7 days]	6–10 months	8–12 months	10–14 months	12–18 months
Marijuana or soft drugs, simple possession (small quantity for own use)				
Property offenses (theft or simple possession of stolen property) less than $1000				
Low moderate				
Alcohol law violations	8–12 months	12–16 months	16–20 months	20–28 months
Counterfeit currency (passing/possession less than $1000)				
Immigration law violations				
Income tax evasion (less than $10,000)				
Property offenses (forgery/fraud/theft from mail/ embezzlement/interstate transportation of stolen or forged securities/receiving stolen property with intent to resell) less than $1000				
Selective Service Act violations				
Moderate				
Bribery of a public official (offering or accepting)	12–16 months	16–20 months	20–24 months	24–32 months
Counterfeit currency (passing/possession $1000 to $19,999)				
Drugs:				
Marijuana, possession with intent to distribute/ sale [small scale (e.g., less than 50 lb.)]				
"Soft drugs", possession with intent to distribute/ sale (less than $500)				
Escape (secure program or institution, or absent 7 days or more — no fear or threat used)				
Firearms Act, possession/purchase/sale (single weapon: not sawed-off shotgun or machine gun)				
Income tax evasion ($10,000–$50,000)				
Mailing threatening communication(s)				
Misprison of felony				
Property offenses (theft/forgery/fraud/embezzlement/ interstate transportation of stolen or forged securities/receiving stolen property) $1000–$19,999				
Smuggling/transporting of alien(s)				
Theft of motor vehicle (not multiple theft or for resale)				
High				
Counterfeit currency (passing/possession $20,000–$100,000)	16–20 months	20–26 months	26–34 months	34–44 months

Counterfeiting (manufacturing)				
Drugs:				
Marijuana, possession with intent to distribute/sale [medium scale (e.g., 50–1999 lb.)]				
"Soft drugs", possession with intent to distribute/sale ($500–$5000)				
Explosives, possession/transporation				
Firearms Act, possession/purchase/sale [sawed-off shotgun(s), machine gun(s), or multiple weapons]				
Mann Act (no force—commercial purposes)				
Theft of motor vehicle for resale				
Property offenses (theft/forgery/fraud/embezzlement/interstate transportation of stolen or forged securities/receiving stolen property) $20,000–$100,000				
Very high				
Robbery (weapon or threat)	26–36 months	36–48 months	48–60 months	60–72 months
Breaking and entering (bank or post office—entry or attempted entry to vault)				
Drugs:				
Marijuana, possession with intent to distribute/sale [large scale (e.g., 2000 lbs. or more)]				
"Soft drugs," possession with intent to distribute/sale (over $5000)				
"Hard drugs," possession with intent to distribute/sale (not exceeding $100,000)				
Extortion				
Mann Act (force)				
Property offenses (theft/forgery/fraud/embezzlement/interstate transportation of stolen or forged securities/receiving stolen property) over $100,000 but not exceeding $500,000				
Greatest I				
Aggravated felony (e.g., robbery: weapon fired—no serious injury)	40–55 months	55–70 months	70–85 months	85–110 months
Explosive detonation [involving potential risk of physical injury to person(s)—no serious injury occurred]				
Robbery [multiple instances (2 or 3)]				
Hard drugs [possession with intent to distribute/sale—large scale (e.g., over $100,000)]				
Sexual act-force (e.g., forcible rape)				
Greatest II				
Aggravated felony—serious injury (e.g., injury involving substantial risk of death, or protracted disability, or disfigurement)	Greater than above—however, specific ranges are not given because of the limited number of cases and the extreme variation possible within the category.			
Aircraft hijacking				
Espionage				
Kidnaping				
Homicide (intentional or committed during other crime)				

[a]Notes: 1. These guidelines are predicated upon good institutional conduct and program performance.
2. If an offense behavior is not listed above, the proper category may be obtained by comparing the severity of the offense behavior with those of similar offense behaviors listed.

3. If an offense behavior can be classified under more than one category, the most serious applicable category is to be used.
4. If an offense behavior involved multiple separate offenses, the severity level may be increased.
5. If a continuance is to be given, allow 30 days (1 months) for release program provision.
6. "Hard drugs" include heroin, cocaine, morphine, or opiate derivatives, and synthetic opiate substitutes. "Soft drugs" include, but are not limited to, barbiturates, amphetamines, LSD, and hashish.
7. Conspiracy shall be rated for guideline purposes according to the underlying offense behavior if such behavior was consummated. If the offense is unconsummated, the conspiracy will be rated one step below the consummated offense.

APPENDIX 2: Salient Factor Score (Revised) (Effective 4/1/77)

Register No. _____ Name _____

Item A ..... ☐
No prior convictions (adult or juvenile) = 3
One prior conviction = 2
Two or three prior convictions = 1
Four or more prior convictions = 0

Item B ..... ☐
No prior incarcerations (adult or juvenile) = 2
One or two prior incarcerations = 1
Three or more prior incarcerations = 0

Item C ..... ☐
Age at first commitment (adult or juvenile)
26 years or older = 2
18–25 = 1
17 or younger = 0

Item D[a] ..... ☐
Commitment offense did not involve auto theft or check(s) (forgery/larceny) = 1
Commitment offense involved auto theft (X) or check(s) (Y) or both (Z) = 0

Item E[a] ..... ☐
Never had parole revoked or been committed for a new offense while on parole, and not a probation violator this time = 1
Has had parole revoked or been committed for a new offense while on parole (X) or is a probation violator this time (Y) or both (Z) = 0

Item F ..... ☐
No history of heroin or opiate dependence = 1
Otherwise = 0

Item G ..... ☐
Verified employment (or full-time school attendance) for a total of at least 6 months during the last 2 years in the community = 1
Otherwise = 0

Total score ..... ☐

[a]Note to examiners: if item D or E is scored 0, place the appropriate letter (X, Y, or Z) on the line to the right of the box.

APPENDIX 3: Percent Favorable Outcome by Revised Salient Factor Score—1971 Releasees (3-Year Follow-Up)

Salient factor score	Criterion measure X (no new "commitment")	Criterion measure Y (no new "conviction")	Criterion measure Z (no new "arrest")	*N*
Very good (11–9)	93.5	91.5	82.6	201
11	95.2	92.9	85.7	42
10	97.6	96.4	90.4	83
9	88.2	85.5	72.4	76
Good (8–6)	74.9	70.2	60.7	295
8	73.8	71.3	63.8	80
7	81.3	76.0	69.8	96
6	70.6	64.7	51.3	119
Fair (5–4)	61.7	54.4	43.7	316
5	61.4	54.5	44.8	145
4	62.0	54.4	42.7	171
Poor (3–0)	50.9	42.3	31.3	326
3	53.8	43.4	32.4	145
2	51.6	44.5	33.6	128
1	40.4	34.0	23.4	47
0	—	—	—	6[a]
All scores	67.7	61.6	51.4	1,138
Mean cost rating (MCR)	.36	.39	.40	
Point-biserial correlation (*r*)	.32	.36	.37	

[a]Percentages were not calculated because of the small number of cases. Of the six cases, the number scored as having favorable outcome on criterion measures X, Y, and Z were 3, 2, and 1, respectively.

APPENDIX 4: Percent Favorable Outcome by Revised Salient Factor Score Group: Present and Previous Samples (Criterion Measure X)[a]

	Percent favorable outcome				
	2-year follow-up				3-year follow-up
Salient factor score	1970 (C)[b]	1970 (V)[c]	1971	1972	1971
9–11	91.4 (151)	91.1 (280)	94.5 (201)	94.4 (178)	93.5 (201)
6–8	75.0 (240)	77.2 (425)	80.7 (295)	82.1 (268)	74.9 (295)
4–5	60.5 (243)	67.5 (415)	66.5 (316)	71.3 (247)	61.7 (316)
0–3	51.1 (268)	57.3 (461)	58.6 (326)	57.2 (318)	50.9 (326)
All scores	66.7 (902)	71.3 (1581)	72.8 (1138)	73.8 (1011)	67.7 (1138)
MCR	.35	.32	.36	.37	.36
Point-biserial correlation (r)	.31	.27	.29	.31	.32

[a]The first line across the table identifies the sample by year of release. The upper number in each cell is the percent favorable outcome; the lower number (in parentheses) is the N for the cell.
[b]Construction sample.
[c]Validation sample.

APPENDIX 5: Percent Unfavorable Outcome in Relation to Time at Risk by Revised Salient Factor Score—1971 Sample[a]

Salient factor score	Percent unfavorable outcome of cases at risk (actual number of unfavorable outcomes)		
	First year	Second year	Third year
Total (all scores) (N = 1138)[b]			
Criterion measure (X)	18.2(207)	11.0(102)	7.1(59)
Criterion measure (Z)	32.4(367)	16.9(130)	8.2(52)
Very good risk (9–11) (N = 201)			
Criterion measure (X)	2.5(5)	3.1(6)	1.1(2)
Criterion measure (Z)	9.0(18)	6.6(12)	2.9(5)
Good risk (6–8) (N = 295)			
Criterion measure (X)	11.8(32)	9.1(24)	7.1(17)
Criterion measure (Z)	21.7(64)	14.7(34)	9.1(18)
Fair risk (4–5) (N = 316)			
Criterion measure (X)	23.4(74)	13.6(33)	7.2(15)
Criterion measure (Z)	40.0(126)	19.6(37)	9.2(14)
Poor risk (0–3) (N = 326)			
Criterion measure (X)	29.4(96)	17.0(39)	13.1(25)
Criterion measure (Z)	49.2(159)	28.7(47)	12.8(15)

[a]The number of cases at risk is the N for the group minus the number of unfavorable outcomes recorded during the preceding period(s). It is apparent that the "arrest" criterion measure (Z) diminishes cases at risk faster than the "commitment" criterion measure (X).
[b]There were four subjects with unfavorable outcome on criterion Z (three in the "poor risk" and one in the "fair risk" categories) for whom the date of arrest was unavailable. These cases were excluded from analysis in relation to this criterion measure.